+ + + + +

MEETING

+ + + + +

Friday, September 16, 2005

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Room 540 at 624 Ninth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. at 9:30 a.m., Gerald A. Reynolds, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

GERALD A. REYNOLDS, CHAIRMAN

ABIGAIL THERNSTROM, Vice CHAIRMAN

JENNIFER C. BRACERAS, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner

ASHLEY L. TAYLOR, JR., Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner (via telephone)

KENNETH L. MARCUS, Staff Director

STAFF PRESENT:

TERESA BROOKS

CHRISTOPHER BYRNES

DEBRA CARR, ESQ., Associate Deputy Staff Director

IVY DAVIS, Director ERO/Acting Chief, Regional

Programs Coordination Unit

NEAL R. GROSS

STAFF PRESENT (Continued):

TERRI DICKERSON, Assistant Staff Director

PAMELA A. DUNSTON, Chief, Administrative Services and Clearinghouse Division

BARBARA FONTANA

LATRICE FOSHEE

DORELLE GRAY

GEORGE M. HARBISON, Director, Human Resources

Division/Acting Chief, Budget and Finance

Division

SETH JAFFE

SOCK-FOON MACDOUGALL

TINA LOUISE MARTIN, Director for Management, Office of Management

EMMA MONROIG, Solicitor/Parliamentarian

AONGHAS ST. HILAIRE

AUDREY WRIGHT

MIREILLE ZIESENISS

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER JENNINGS

LISA NEUDER

KIMBERLY SCHULD

CONTENTS

<u>PA</u> (<u>GE</u>
I. Approval of Agenda	4
II. Approval of Minutes	5
III. Announcements	6
IV. Staff Director's Report	11
V. State Advisory Committee Issues	20
VI. Future Scheduling	44

PROCEEDINGS

1 (9:33 a.m.)2 3 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: This meeting Okay. will come to order. 4 5 This is a meeting with most of the participating Commissioners here in Washington. 6 7 exception. Commissioner is There's an Yaki participating by telephone. 8

> Commissioner Yaki, are you there? COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes.

I. Approval of Agenda

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Very good. Okay. The first item on the agenda is the approval of Section 3 of the agenda should be amended in agenda. order to postpone until further notice the briefing on the Patriot Act as it relates to anti-Arab and anti-Muslim intolerance.

May I have a motion?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: I just want to thank the rest of the Commission for allowing this to be postponed so that I could participate in person when I am actually in Washington, D.C. So thank you very

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	much.
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let's vote. All
3	in favor, please indicate by saying aye.
4	(Chorus of ayes.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
6	(No response.)
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay.
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I was just
9	going to say if they were what would happen.
10	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, we just want to
11	have it on the record.
12	Okay. The motion passes unanimously.
1 2	II. Approval of Minutes
13	TI. Approvar or minutes
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We
14 15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that the SAC working group can continue its work.
14 15 16 17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that the SAC working group can continue its work. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.
14 15 16 17 18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that the SAC working group can continue its work. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
14 15 16 17 18 19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that the SAC working group can continue its work. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Second?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that the SAC working group can continue its work. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Second? COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that the SAC working group can continue its work. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Second? COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Now, the agenda. We have some additional amendments. There is a motion to postpone a vote on the state advisory reports so that the SAC working group can continue its work. VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Second? COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you. Discussion?

1	say aye.
2	(Chorus of ayes.)
3	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
4	(No response.)
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
6	passes unanimously.
7	Please let the record reflect that
8	Commissioner Braceras has joined us.
9	The second item is the approval of the
10	minutes of the July 22nd and August 26th meetings.
11	May I have a motion?
12	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So moved.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: May I have a second?
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Second.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any discussion?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor, please
18	say aye.
19	(Chorus of ayes.)
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
21	(No response.)
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes
23	unanimously.
24	
25	III. Announcements

Okav. Αt this point next up announcements. I'd like to take a minute on behalf of the Commission to acknowledge the victims of Hurricane Katrina in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Although these people have experienced unbearable hardships and may continue to do so for some time, we all can take solace in the amazing outpouring of support these individuals have received from their fellow citizens in surrounding states and from all over the United States.

On behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I encourage all who are here today, as well as all people, to contribute to Katrina relief efforts in any way you see fit.

Finally, on February -- September 2nd, a special message was sent to SAC members in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi expressing the Commission's best wishes on behalf of the Commissioners, Staff Directors and staff, as well as asking that they report to the central regional office any allegations of discrimination in the recovery efforts.

This week is National Historical Black Colleges and Universities Week. HBCUs have educated many American leaders and continue to play an instrumental role in providing educational

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

opportunities for all people.

This Commission is dedicated to insuring that these valued institutions continue to maximize their ability to contribute to our intellectual and cultural progress, and we'll conduct a briefing in the coming year to investigate the best ways to achieve this goal.

Yesterday marked the beginning of Hispanic Heritage Month. This is a month which we celebrate the tremendous contributions of Latinos to our country. On behalf of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I call upon all people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Yesterday, September 15th, marked the 42nd anniversary of the 1963 bombing of the 16th Street Baptist Church in Birmingham, Alabama by the Klu Klux Klan. This tragic bombing carried out by cowardly racists killed four young black girls. Events such as this one hopefully can teach us to remain ever vigilant to assure that those who attempt to impose their will on their fellow Americans by force or coercion are never allowed to do so.

Next up we will discuss some personnel matters. First I'd like to announce that Jenny Park,

an attorney advisor at the Commission for over five years, left the Commission earlier this week to accept a position with the Patent and Trademark Office. On behalf of the Commission, I want to acknowledge her excellent contributions to the Commission over these past years. We all wish her the best in her new position.

Cecilia Towns, who cannot be here today, began an internship with the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation earlier this week. Cecilia is a senior at Howard University majoring in African American studies. She will be with the Commission through December 6th.

And at this point we'll hear from the Staff Director.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I just wanted to make one brief note that the Roberts civil rights record that my assistant had prepared and we distributed at the last meeting was introduced into the record of the Roberts confirmation hearing, and I think that's a good thing. It, I think, fleshes out the record of Judge Roberts. I think it's good for the Commission to have weighed in in some fashion

1	without, you know, an opinion.
2	And, again, I appeared in my personal
3	capacity yesterday, and we may want to think at some
4	point about, as part of our clearing house function,
5	making that report available generally to the public.
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I think that we
7	should prepare a motion and at our next meeting have
8	discussions on Commissioner Braceras?
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I haven't received
10	a copy of it yet.
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: That's amazing.
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I've asked several
13	people several times. Remember I E-mailed you back
14	that I couldn't open it and could I have a hard copy?
15	It's okay.
16	And I mentioned it to Chairman Reynolds.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And I asked someone to
18	do it. Okay, okay.
19	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: So I have
20	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Let's do magic.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Thank you. I
22	will do so now.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Neither
25	Commissioner Braceras nor Commissioner Kirsanow

1	testified yesterday speaking for the Commission. They
2	went there speaking for themselves, but I want to
3	commend both of them on the superb job that they did,
4	and it was nice to see two faces of the Commission
5	even in an unofficial capacity do as well as both of
6	them did.
7	
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. At this point
10	we'll hear from the Staff Director.
11	IV. Staff Director's Report
12	MR. MARCUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
13	Madam Vice Chairman, Commissioners.
14	If it please the Commission I'd like to
15	extend my written Staff Director's report with brief
16	additional remarks regarding agency reform and
17	Hurricane Katrina.
18	I'll begin with agency reforms. We
19	continue to work toward meeting the goal of
20	implementing all pending GAO recommendations,
21	resources permitting, by mid-January 2005.
22	Considerable progress has been made over the course of
23	the summer.
24	For example, we have recently issued

administrative instructions establishing new controls

for procurement management. These AIs address general regarding centralization GAO concerns over of contracting functions within the office of the Staff Director and the specific recommendation regarding greater controls over contracting activities. We plan to provide more agency reforms

regarding procurement over the coming months.

We've also recently submitted our budget estimate to OMB based on the figures recently approved by the Commission. The budget estimate incorporates new proposed strategic qoals that have been distributed to the Commissioners and on which we are now seeking stakeholder input.

The inclusion of strategic goals reflects the work that we are doing to revamp the agency's strategic planning.

We currently are preparing both a fiveyear strategic plan and a human capital strategic plan which we plan to have available in proposed final form in time for the December meeting. This also responds to a series of GAO recommendations.

We have also recently established a formal policy on telework. Our new telework policy is part a general federal program designed to reduce traffic and improve the environment, improve employee

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

morale and commitment, improve productivity and quality of work, help hire and retain employees, and enable employees to better arrange their use of leave. It is also required by federal law.

Yesterday, we submitted а report to Congress describing the significant steps that undertaken reform agency has to our financial operational project planning, strategic planning, and communications processes. In this report we describe both the significant progress that we have made over the last nine months, as well as significant reform activities still underway.

This report is required by the House appropriations bill committee report. A similar report will be required by the end of this month to the Senate appropriations committee.

I'd also like to say a few words about Hurricane Katrina. As the Chairman has indicated, our regional office coordinator at my request sent a special message to State Advisory Committee members in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi shortly after Hurricane Katrina, and then additional messages were sent to other State Advisory Committees around the country.

These messages expressed best wishes on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

behalf of the Commissioners, the Staff Director and staff of the agency. They also requested that State Advisory Committee members report to the central regional office any allegations of discrimination in the recovery effort. We have received only a few responses from State Advisory Committee members, although our regional offices are tracking media reports.

Last week Louisiana and Alabama SAC members emphasized the following concerns.

One, that needed assistance is not getting to the rural areas; and

Two, that there are reports that Southern
Baptist Convention churches are restricting their
efforts to affiliates only.

This week our central regional office received two additional messages from SAC members. First, one SAC member in Baton Rouge, Louisiana said the following: "I'm volunteering with the Red Cross here. We have one parish that is known for being very segregated, and that is putting it politely. They have essentially told the Red Cross that they do not want 'those people' in their parish. They have made us consolidate our evacuees to one location and indicated that they did not want any new evacuees once

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

those were gone."

Another SAC member in Jackson, Mississippi said the following: "The generosity and support for Katrina victims within Jackson has been amazing. Fortunately, I am unable to report any racial problems."

Those are the responses that we've gotten from SAC members. To the extent that we get additional reports over the coming weeks and months we will continue to pass them along to the Commission members. That is my report.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Could you shed some additional light on this move in the Senate to reduce our budget by \$96,000?

MR. MARCUS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The House of Representatives had recently passed an appropriations bill which provided funding for this agency for fiscal year 2006 at a level of \$9.096 million, which is consistent with our 2005 funding and is also consistent with the amount requested in the President's budget.

Recently the Senate has been debating an appropriations bill that would provide funding to the agency of only \$9 million even, which is a \$96,000 reduction from our current budget.

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: And it's my
2	understanding that the folks in the Senate believe
3	that this is not a reduction in our budget; is that
4	correct?
5	MR. MARCUS: The language in the committee
6	report indicated that the \$9 million even would
7	represent a slight increase of, I believe, \$25,000
8	over 2005 levels. We're trying to determine why they
9	believe that it would be an increase when it appears
10	to be a decrease in the amount of \$96,000, and we'll
11	be communicating appropriately with congressional
12	staff.
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any other
14	questions or concerns?
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes. Mr. Staff
16	Director, a couple of things. One is where are we
17	right now with respect to getting on line for the
18	audit or can we implement an audit at this point?
19	MR. MARCUS: We have now issued two
20	requests for proposals. The first time we issued a
21	request for proposals there were a number of responses
22	by outside accounting firms who were interested in
23	submitting a bid, but in the end none of them did.
24	We then went back to them to ask why they
25	did not submit a bid. They had various reasons. Some

of them indicated that they simply did not have enough time. Others indicated that they didn't think they would have enough resources to do it. At least one indicated that they did not think that we would be auditable for the 2005 fiscal year.

Based on the fact that some of the accountants suggested that they might have submitted a bid if they had had more time to do so, we then issued a second RFP. The deadline for responding to that RFP passed approximately a week ago.

We received three bids and a few non-bid responses. We have contacted at least one of the nonbidders to find out why they hadn't bid, and we found out that it was not based on a concern that we were not auditable.

So we now have three bids to choose among, and we are currently in the process of assembling a technical panel to review them, including making contacts to persons outside the agency who have sufficient technical expertise that they could assist us in choosing among the panelists in determining to what extent the bids are appropriate and could provide the services we require.

COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Mr. Chair, just a suggestion. You know, for a while we have suspended

the regular meetings of the Budget Committee mainly because there wasn't a whole lot to report. We may want to revisit whether or not we should have a couple of meetings as matters develop so that we don't take up time here talking about it.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Did you have any conversations? My concern is that we have at least one firm that has concluded that because of our lack of documentation we cannot be audited. I don't want to spend money and then at the end of the process have whichever firm that is selected reach the same conclusion.

I don't know if this is possible, but on the front end could we ask the three companies that have submitted bids to render an opinion as to whether it's possible to audit our books if we were to provide them with a description of the type of documentation we have in our possession?

Based on that information, they could give us an indication whether they were confident that at the end of the process, you know, that they would not tell us that an audit is not possible.

MR. MARCUS: We can certainly review both with our legal staff and also with our outside procurement consultant, to the extent that's

can certainly speak to them about it. 2 It is my understanding that those three 3 4 bidders did believe that we were auditable, and at 5 least one of the non-bidders did explicitly state that they believed that we are auditable. They're just not 6 sure the amount of time and resources that would be 7 8 required to audit us. We have heard from some outsiders that the 9 issue in their mind is not so much whether we were 10 11 auditable as the amount of time and resources 12 necessary to complete the job, but we'll be happy to 13 consult with legal and procurement consultants 14 determine whether we can seek additional statements 15 from the bidders. 16 Okay. Commissioner CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: 17 Kirsanow. 18 COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Thank you. 19 Mr. Staff Director, I don't know if you 20 With respect to the Senate appropriations, know this. do we have any kind of a timetable for when this all 21 22 goes to conference? 23 MR. MARCUS: We've not heard a timetable, but we can certainly make inquiries and pass the 24 25 information along to the Commissioners.

permissible within the rules, and if it is, then we

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: I mean, as we all
2	know, we spoke with a number of people on the
3	congressional side several months ago, and it may be a
4	good idea to revisit that procedure.
5	MR. MARCUS: The matter was still being
6	debated by the Senate yesterday. They may have passed
7	it yesterday. If not, I expect it imminently and we
8	can find out when it will go to conference.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any other questions,
10	concerns, comments?
11	(No response.)
12	V. State Advisory Committee Issues
13	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have some
14	additional motions. Here I'll read the next motion.
15	It reads:
16	"I move that the Commission request that
17	the State Advisory Committees in the regions and
18	states to be identified by the General Counsel take up
19	the desegregation status of public school districts
20	within their jurisdiction as a research project. This
21	project will support the work of the Office of General
22	Counsel in producing the 2007 statutory enforcement
23	report on the same topic.
24	"As of 2001, there were 400 school
25	districts still under federal supervision with respect

1	to desegregation. The Commission's statutory
2	enforcement report on the desegregation status of
3	elementary and secondary schools would examine the
4	unitary status of the schools and possibly others to
5	determine the success or failure of desegregation. It
6	would be helpful to have State Advisory Committees in
7	all states affected by court desegregation orders
8	collect data on the relevant school districts within
9	their respective jurisdictions."
10	May I have a motion?
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: So moved.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?
13	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Second.
14	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
15	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Go ahead, Jen.
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: No. You, Madam
17	Vice Chair.
18	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Give us a
19	little background on this. Has there been a
20	conversation with the regional offices, the State
21	Advisory Committees as to their capacity to do exactly
22	what?
23	MR. MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, if I may.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
25	MR. MARCUS: There have been a few

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

conversations in some regions, but not potentially affected regions. The southern regional office has already developed a number of ideas about and, in can be done fact, communicating with State Advisory Committees in their region and has done a considerable amount of work on look into the current desegregation efforts in their states.

Within the central regional office, there has been some discussion at a preliminary level, although I don't believe that there has been work done.

There are other regional offices that are potentially implicated around the country where I don't believe work has been done.

We are now at a point where I expect that there would be work by some State Advisory Committees, but this is certainly something where we could profit from having views of a larger number, and if so, have nationwide coordination to insure that the data is as consistent as possible.

There are precedents for requests by the Commission that State Advisory Committees look into matters. Since under FACA they are independent entities, they can look at issues that they choose to,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

but the Commission has, for instance, after September 11 recommended that State Advisory Committees look into post 9/11 issues, and State Advisory Committees have done so.

This is already an issue that is being looked into by some SACs, and the question is whether it would be helpful to urge that a greater number of them look into it.

Currently, as the Commissioners recall, there is a project that has been approved for the Office of General Counsel for 2007 regarding elementary and secondary desegregation. It will be the statutory enforcement report for this year.

The Office of General Counsel, of course, is far smaller now than it was a few years ago. It was only a few years ago that there were more than ten attorneys in the Office of General Counsel. We currently have two attorneys. So they are now under a challenge to be able to do meaningful analyses at the same time they are doing the legal work of the agency.

By having the State Advisory Committees look at things first and then provide that by way of support to the Office of General Counsel, we could satisfy a few different goals. One is we could insure or at least recommend that State Advisory Committees

are working on issues that have been identified as national priorities by this Commission when it votes on these projects.

Second, it can be a way of compensating for a lack of resources both at a regional level and at the Office of General Counsel by having a greater degree of cooperation between the Office of General Counsel, the regional offices, and the State Advisory Committees.

Third, it can enrich both the work of the State Advisory Committees and the Office of General Counsel by having an interchange between the two.

With respect to the State Advisory Committees, they have a capacity to bring a great deal of local information and knowledge to issues that really are local in nature, and when it comes to these desegregation agreements, we see a great deal of local variations even within particular states.

At the same time, our regional staff does not include any attorneys so that by involving the regional offices with the Office of General Counsel, we have a natural way to combine the local information in connection with the State Advisory Committee, the social scientific expertise that we have at the regional level, as well as the legal expertise within

the Office of General Counsel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: You know, I appreciate everything that you're saying, but -- there is a "but" here -- before I am willing to urge a large number of SACs to work on this, I'd like to see something of the work that the SACs that area already engaged in this issue have done so that I have some sense of whether I think the questions they're asking are the right ones, the way they're collecting data is correct, what we're likely to get at the end of the day.

I wonder if this can't be done in stages so that we have a little bit more information before we sign onto a kind of blanket request here.

What I would propose is as MR. MARCUS: I have already asked the Office of General Counsel to expedite their work in developing the discovery plan in conceptual phase for the elementary and secondary projects. Since it's a 2007 project, they would normally not doing be that considerable length of time, but I would like to get at a national level a model working with the regional offices so that we can get Commissioner input at an early stage quide the State Advisorv that can Committees.

What I'm concerned about is that if we don't do that and the State Advisory Committees go too far too quickly, since some of them are already looking at the issue, we may be deprived of the opportunity to get SAC input on the issues and methodologies that the Commissioners choose to have.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay, but if we were to give those SACs that are already working on the issue input rather than extending the invitation for everybody to join in the effort, then we would be developing guidelines for SACs that will subsequently be looking at the issue.

I mean, you know, I would just like to see up front what's been done so far, again, what the questions being asked, et cetera, are and so that they get our input at this stage before we've got an awful lot of SACs working on the same issue.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom, so you don't think there will be sufficient time to revise or redirect the efforts after we have prepared a document that lays out the process and the questions, the methodology?

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It just seems to me the earlier we deliver messages about how we would like to see the issue framed, obviously they are

1	independent, but how we would like to see the issue
2	framed, the better off we are, and the best way to do
3	that is to look at the work of SACs who have already
4	started down this road.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any other
6	comments?
7	(No response.)
8	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All right. So, Ken,
9	at this point who started work on the project?
10	MR. MARCUS: Work has been started and
11	considerable work has been done within the Southern
12	Regional Office.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Good. Can we
14	look at that? Is there anything to look at?
15	MR. MARCUS: I can certainly provide a
16	description of the methodology that they're following,
17	certainly.
18	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Have they collected
19	any data at this point?
20	MR. MARCUS: Yes.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. So
22	if I understand, Vice Chair Thernstrom, the concerns
23	that you've just expressed, that what you would like
24	to do is to table this issue until we've had an
25	opportunity to review the work or at least some of the

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: 2 That's correct. 3 I would like to table the motion as currently 4 written, yes, until we've had an opportunity to get 5 our arms around what's been done. This would not CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 6 affect our timetable; is that correct? 7 8 MR. MARCUS: If we postpone it, then the soonest we could vote on this is a month from now, and 9 10 the only issue is whether in the intervening months 11 there are State Advisory Committees that would vote to 12 undertake different projects for the incoming year and 13 so they wouldn't be looking at that. That's the only clarification. 14 15 CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. We have what I 16 will treat as a motion to table. 17 VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yes. Let me 18 just ask a question about that. Is there some way of 19 communicating to the SACs that we will be in a month 20 taking up this issue and they might keep in mind that 21 we have a particular interest, but we have not yet voted on the matter? 22 23 I suppose we could, although MR. MARCUS: at this point I think that we wouldn't be asking them 24 25 to look at elementary and secondary. All that I could

1

work that has been done.

	tell them at this point without further guidance is
2	that the Commissioners are considering whether or not
3	to make a recommendation that
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Okay. Well,
5	that's fine. At least it alerts them that this is an
6	issue of potential interest to us.
7	MR. MARCUS: We could certainly pass that
8	along.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is there a
10	second?
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
12	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Additional discussion?
13	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I have a question.
14	Did we have (unintelligible) Voting Rights Act?
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: I'm sorry,
16	Commissioner Yaki. I didn't understand you.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's not
18	because you=
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Am I incomprehensible
20	or you
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, no, no.
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. That's much
23	better.
24	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's purely an
25	electronic problem.
1	

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I've heard that excuse
2	before.
3	Just asking did we ever ask the SACs to do
4	anything similar with regard to the Voting Rights Act.
5	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Does anyone recall?
6	MR. MARCUS: I don't believe so. We had
7	not done this very frequently in the past, although
8	this is a model that, if successful, I think we should
9	consider doing for projects in the future.
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, obviously the
11	VRA is the big project for next year and probably the
12	member states that would be looking at this would be
13	limited by (unintelligible) to consider that as well.
14	I would, for the purposes of comity c-o-m-i-t-y,
15	not comedy acquiesce with Commissioner Thernstrom's
16	request for, I guess, a stay of this forum. I will in
17	the end be supporting the Staff Director
18	recommendation.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Additional comments?
20	(No response.)
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All in support
22	of Vice Chair Thernstrom's motion please say aye.
23	(Chorus of ayes.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
25	(No response.)

1	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. The motion
2	passes unanimously.
3	Next up. Here's the motion.
4	"I move that the Commission approve the
5	report produced by the Office of the Staff Director on
6	the briefing the Commission held on July 15th, 2005,
7	on the stagnation of the black middle class. The
8	report as distributed in draft form to Commissioners
9	includes an executive summary of the panelists'
10	testimony, their written statements and statements
11	from the Chairman" that's me "and Commissioner
12	Yaki."
13	May I have a motion?
14	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved.
15	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: A second?
16	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Discussion?
18	(No response.)
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in favor please
20	indicate by saying aye.
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Any in opposition?
23	(No response.)
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: The motion passes
25	unanimously.

Okay. Let's see what we have left.

Okay. I believe this is the last motion.

"In Adarand v. Pena, the Supreme Court quoting Richmond v. Croson stated that searching judicial inquiry into the justification for such race based measures, there is simply no way of classifications determining what are benign remedial and what classifications are, in illegitimate of motivated notions racial by inferiority or simple racial politics.' The Court went on to hold that federal programs that use racial classification are subject to strict judicial scrutiny.

"While the Court has not provided clear guidance on the contours of the strict scrutiny standard, it is clear that any state or federal agency that uses racial preferences must provide a strong basis in evidence for the conclusion that the use of racial preferences is necessary.

"In an attempt to comply with this constitutional requirement, federal and state agencies and contractors have commissioned disparity studies to demonstrate discrimination with the statistical analysis showing under representation of minorities or women among federal contractors. The briefing would

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	feature academic experts, and the subject matter, who
2	can provide a wide range of viewpoints about the
3	methodological and empirical strength and quality of
4	disparity studies conducted since 1995 and the
5	relationship of these studies to federal agencies'
6	procurement activities."
7	May I have a motion in support?
8	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: So moved, but
9	because I don't know my Robert's Rules the way I
10	should
11	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We're pretty informal
12	around here.
13	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: it seems to
14	me the sentence "in an attempt to comply" should
15	include or it should read "federal and state agencies,
16	municipalities, and contractors." A lot of these
17	disparity studies have been commissioned by
18	municipalities.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I will take
20	that as an amendment. Is there a second to the
21	amended motion?
22	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Second.
23	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Thank you.
24	Discussion?
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Discussion. What

would be the timing?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Staff Director Marcus?

MR. MARCUS: I would recommend December for it, the advantage being that it would be in the same calendar year as two important studies. First, the Adarand report that we're doing, and second, a report by the National Academy of Science dealing with disparity studies, and I would think that it would be useful to have this briefing close in time and

9 useful to have this briefing close in time and
10 preferably in the same calendar year as those two, as

11 the reports come out.

COMMISSIONER YAKI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Vice Chair Thernstrom.

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I'm just looking at this same sentence again. I don't think contractors themselves, but I could be wrong, have commissioned disparity studies. It's really federal and state agencies as well as municipalities. I don't believe contractors are commissioning these, but I could be wrong again. Other people here probably know better.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, I don't know.

Out of an abundance of caution, how about if we just leave that in. I don't think anything would turn on it if we turn out to be wrong or if you turn out to be

1	right, I should say.
2	Commissioner Taylor.
3	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I just have a
4	question as to the direction. It seems rather narrow,
5	and I just want to make sure. Is that intentional?
6	We're going to focus on really the debate as to the
7	quality of the study. Is that what we're really
8	focusing on here rather than this third bullet point,
9	which to me personally is probably more important
10	relative to Adarand in the sense that even if you have
11	a study that is properly done and you demonstrate the
12	disparities, I mean, that's just the first question.
13	So are we intentionally being this narrow
14	or maybe it's just me that thinks it. I'm more
15	concerned about the second question than I am, quite
16	frankly, about the first.
17	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Let me catch up
18	with you. I'm trying to find that bullet point that
19	you're referring to.
20	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Yeah, me, too.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: What bullet
22	point? What are you looking at?
23	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: The scope.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Are you in Section 7?
25	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. I'm sorry.

Mine is maybe numbered a little differently than you
all.
VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I don't have
any numbers at all. That's the problem.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Lisa is going to
help here.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Does everyone
have the document?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't have the
document.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Would you mind
reading the particular bullet that you're concerned
about?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: This relates to the
scope of the study, and the third bullet point reads,
"The relationship of these studies to federal
agencies' procurement activities," which is something
I agree with.
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay, and your
concern?
COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I'm sorry. Just
to clarify, is this the document that was prepared
just for your personal use?
CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: No, it's in the
briefing book.
briefing book.

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It is in the
2	briefing book.
3	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't have that.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: It's at the
5	very end, Jennifer, very end. In fact, it's the last
6	page.
7	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I didn't receive
8	it.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Did you look in
10	Section 8?
11	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: I don't think I
12	have that section for some reason.
13	Okay. That's fine. I think for some
14	reason we either didn't receive that one or just
15	missed it. Okay. Thank you very much.
16	MR. MARCUS: Let me say that there was not
17	intended to be a discrepancy between the concept paper
18	and motion. The idea is that the briefing will look
19	primarily at the methodologies used in the disparities
20	studies, but that the briefing may be broad enough to
21	include not just the narrow methodological question,
22	but also as the bullet point points out, the
23	relationship of these studies to federal agencies'
24	procurement.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes, but that was a

1 part of the motion also. COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: 2 It was. just Ι 3 wanted to get a sense of the body as to what folks were most interested in and as we identified potential 4 5 panelists and speakers. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. 6 7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: It was more of a 8 question than anything else. CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Well, you have kicked 9 10 up all of this dust here. 11 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, it was just a 12 general question. I mean, I'm just personally -- and 13 even if we agree that the study, again, has been 14 properly done and demonstrates disparities, I mean, I 15 just tend to be more focused on the next question. 16 **REYNOLDS:** Okay, and please CHAIRMAN articulate that. 17 18 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: From my perspective at least the next question is rather simple, and 19 20 again, this is how I frame the issue. I tend not to 21 be as focused on whether or not there are disparities 22 since I can agree that there's a disparity and then 23 start to focus on the important policy issue, that is, whether or not, again, as we addressed in our Adarand 24

report, whether or not we ask the agencies to do the

hard work of identifying the hurdles in place that are creating the disparities.

And then the second question is whether or not they're really focusing whether in a race neutral way or race conscious way on addressing those issues.

As it was read, at least, this sounded narrowly crafted to address methodology, which is important because we've also had discussions about disparity generally, and if it's intended to touch upon that for those studies, then I wanted to know that versus that broader question.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. I'm just going to jump in here quickly. At least my view of this proposal, it's first to assess the factual predicate for using racial preferences, and also I hope that this proposal would also look into whether -- well, you may have a statistical disparity that has nothing to do with discriminatory conduct, and for example, do they disaggregate those types of statistical -- well, under representation type of versus could be traced back representation that to discriminatory conduct.

So that's what I was thinking, and the rest of the Commission will speak for themselves.

Vice Chair Thernstrom?

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Yeah.
2	Commissioner Taylor, it seems to me we're not simply
3	examining methodology here. I think we're also
4	looking at the underlying assumptions, and this is
5	really piggybacking on what the Chair just said.
6	And on the same page that you're looking
7	at, one of the sentences says here the critiques point
8	to a number of questions are listed, but the last one
9	is the lack of a theory of discrimination underlying
10	the study.
11	And I would hope that as we look at this
12	issue we would talk precisely about that, that is,
13	precisely about the relationship between disparities
14	and discrimination.
15	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay, okay.
16	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And how do you
17	know when there's a close connection and where the
18	questions lie when the connection seems more tenuous.
19	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Commissioner Taylor,
20	thank you for kicking up the dust. It has helped
21	clarify the issue.
22	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I just wondered what
23	our other folks were reading. That's all.
24	MR. MARCUS: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I
25	think there is one point where it would be useful to

1	have some clarity. While the issues that Vice
2	Chairman Thernstrom indicated are part of this scope,
3	as it was written the scope does not include and was
4	not intended to include the question as to whether
5	agencies assure us they're assuring race neutral
6	alternatives.
7	That, of course, is the main subject of
8	the report, but it is not intended to be part of the
9	briefing. I suppose it could be but that was not part
10	of the scope. If Commissioners wanted a change, then
11	we could make the change.
12	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: No, no. I did
13	not mean to indicate that that become part of the
14	scope, but simply that we flesh out the underlying
15	assumptions.
16	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I know our language
17	has become rather loose. We now equate disparity with
18	discrimination, and we're
19	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Right, right.
20	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: the issue.
21	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Exactly. This
22	report should raise questions about the legitimacy of
23	doing so, and if legitimate, in what context?
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Any other
25	questions or comments?

1	(No response.)
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. At this point
3	we'll vote. All in favor please indicate by saying
4	aye.
5	(Chorus of ayes.)
6	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: All in opposition?
7	(No response.)
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I'll abstain.
9	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Please let the
10	record reflect that Commissioner Yaki abstained. The
11	motion passes.
12	All right. Well, we're at a close. Oh,
13	I'm sorry. Commissioner Braceras.
14	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Just before we
15	adjourn I wanted to ask about the status of the
16	Patriot Act briefing, if that was going to go forward
17	in November. What is the briefing schedule generally
18	for the next several months?
19	MR. MARCUS: October we are planning a
20	briefing on the Voting Rights Act.
21	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
22	MR. MARCUS: November we're trying to put
23	together the campus anti-Semitism briefing. December
24	I would anticipate being the disparity studies issues.
25	COMMISSIONED BDACEDAS. So what did we

1	decide to do with the Patriot Act?
2	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: We haven't decided yet
3	on a date. First we're going to have to circle around
4	and see if we can get the witnesses who we initially
5	secured. We have to check with their schedules, and
6	if everything goes according to plan, they'll be able
7	to participate. If not, we'll have to seek other
8	witnesses of the same caliber.
9	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Well, but we can't
10	see if they're available unless we have a date.
11	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Or some
12	alternative dates.
13	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Okay.
14	Commissioner Yaki, do you still want to go forward
15	with the Patriot Act briefing?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I do.
17	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: And what is your
18	sense of when it would be a good time to hold it?
19	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Ideally as soon as
20	possible, but I would hope as was suggested we give a
21	range of a couple of dates and see which ones best fit
22	the best panel that we can put together. I'll leave
23	that up to the Staff Director's discretion.
24	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Do we have anything
25	planned for January? Do we have any briefings

scheduled?

2.0

MR. MARCUS: The Commissioners voted to do a briefing on the question of discrimination or racial preferences at law schools, the subject of the Professor Richard Sanders' article in either January or February or March, and we've been talking with him about availability, but we haven't specifically fixed something for January.

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. Is there a -- Vice Chair Thernstrom.

VI. Future Scheduling

VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: I have one other matter to bring up before we adjourn. The practice of this Commission is to set the dates of Commission meetings the following year very late in the calendar year, that is, to set the meeting dates for '06 very late in '05.

I find this very difficult since, you know, I've got a calendar that's filling up. Can we by the next Commission meeting put together a schedule of meeting dates and in the future I hope do it earlier?

CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: There's no reason -- correct me if I'm wrong -- there isn't any reason that we wouldn't be able to do it by the next meeting.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

_	MR. MARCOS: We certainly can, and in
2	fact, staff were planning to propose some dates during
3	the October meeting.
4	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: Thanks. I
5	think that's because I already asked before, but we
6	usually do it very late, and that's fine. Good.
7	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. So,
8	Commissioner Braceras, would you be comfortable if Ken
9	were to work on selecting a date so that at our next
10	meeting he could inform us where we stand with respect
11	to the briefing relating to the Patriot Act?
12	COMMISSIONER BRACERAS: Oh, yes. I was
13	just curious as to what had happened because I knew
14	that we needed to cancel it, and I had just never
15	heard anything further. So that's why I just wanted
16	the status update.
17	MR. MARCUS: Okay. So I can go ahead, and
18	I want to make sure that it's clear, and see whether
19	the panelist or people that are equivalent expertise
20	are available for January or February of 2006.
21	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Yes.
22	VICE CHAIRMAN THERNSTROM: And I would
23	like to note that we had put together an excellent
24	panel, and the quality of that panel is our standard.
25	CHAIRMAN REYNOLDS: Okay. All right. We

	46
1	are adjourned.
2	(Whereupon, at 10:23 a.m., the Commission
3	meeting was concluded.)
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
LO	
L1	